

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 12-24 are pending in the present application.  
Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 12-24**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 7-8 and 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,235) in view of Anupam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,330). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 1, 5, 7 and 8, the Office Action states:

As per claims 1, 5, 7-8, Hunt discloses:

- Generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range (column 2, lines 34-40, column 3, lines 3-4, 6-10, 18-20, 47-52, column 5, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 40-42, column 11, lines 5-9, 31-33, 35-37, 40-42, column 12, lines 20-23, 49-51);
- Acquiring an image file name from said server (column 5, lines 34-55, column 9, lines 29-42, column 10, column 12, lines 1-25);
- Converting said image file to generate a predetermined formed compressed image data which has a file name relating to said unique image file name (column 1, lines 48-51, column 8, lines 50-52, column 9, lines 6-15);
- Sending said predetermined formed compressed image data to said server (column 5, lines 18-33, 65-67, column 8, lines 31-52)

Hunt does not explicitly disclose:

- Posting the file name of said predetermined formed compressed image data to the client terminals collaborating with said client terminal.

However, in an analogous art, Anupam discloses creating and joining a collaborative browsing session. When there is a change in URL, the new URL is communicated to the other collaborators in the session (abstract, column 3, lines 25-41, 60-67, column 4, lines 5-15, 31-40, column 5, lines 35-55). Anupam, therefore, discloses posting the file name of predetermined formed compressed image data to the client terminals collaborating with said client terminal.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement posting a file name of image data to the client terminals collaboration with

client terminal in Hunt's method in order to display new URL's to the other computers in the collaborating session.

Office Action dated June 4, 2004, pages 2-3.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 5, 7 and 8 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

1. A method of communicating on a communication system having a client terminal connecting a server through a network and collaborating with other client terminals connected to said network, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range;

(b) acquiring an image file name from said server;

(c) converting said image file to generate a predetermined formed compressed image data which has a file name relating to said image file name;

(d) sending said predetermined formed compressed image data to said server; and

(e) posting the file name of said predetermined formed compressed image data to the client terminals collaborating with said client terminal.

Neither Hunt nor Anupam, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range. The Office action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature at column 2, lines 34-40, column 3, lines 3-4, 6-10, 18-20, 47-52, column 5, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 40-42, column 11, lines 5-9, 31-33, 35-37, 40-42, and column 12, lines 20-23, 49-51, which read as follows:

a request for a graphical image from a client machine, the graphical image being stored on the server machine and having a predetermined total image size; obtaining image control information; determining an appropriate amount of data for the graphical image to be transmitted based on at least the image control information

(Column 2, lines 34-40)

sending image control information from the client machine to the server machine

(Column 3, lines 3-4)

determined amount being based on at least the image control information. Preferably, the determined amount is a reduced amount, and the graphical image file received also has a determined format based on at least the image control information

(Column 3, lines 6-10)

receive the request and the client image control information from the client machine, determine an appropriate amount of data for the graphical image file requested

(Column 3, lines 18-20)

Another advantage is that a user has a choice as to the amount of a graphical image file needed depending on an intended use for the image. For example, if images are simply being displayed in a small one inch by one inch arrangement, then only a small amount of the graphical image file need be transmitted.

(Column 3, lines 47-52)

Each such image is stored on the server 102 as an image file. The client 104 sends a request for an image over a link 106 to the server 102. The server 102 then in turn sends an appropriate amount of data for the corresponding image file to the client 104 over a link 108.

(Column 5, lines 1-5)

As an example, the request would identify the graphical image file desired together with a total image size and a requested quality level.

(Column 9, lines 40-42)

the web server processing 1000 determines 1008 an image format and file size for the requested graphical image file. In effect, the determining 1008 customizes the graphical image file based on criteria such as user's conditions, server's conditions, user's request or author's preference.

(Column 11, lines 5-9)

The image customization processing 1100 initially obtains 1102 image control data from the web browser (client image control data).

(Column 11, lines 31-33)

Next, a decision 1106 determines whether the image control data from the web browser includes a user request.

(Column 11, lines 35-37)

If not, the file size for the determined image file is set 1108 to user\_size, which indicates that the file size is set by a user's choice or expected choice.

(Column 11, lines 40-42)

When the user intends to use the graphical image file for display on a display device, the format includes a display format suitable for the display device associated with the web browser

(Column 12, lines 20-23)

The user preference could be a user selected choice of quality versus size for image files or something that is predicted for the user.

(Column 12, lines 49-51)

While all of these sections may relate to sending images from a client to a server, there is nothing in these sections, or any other section of Hunt, that teaches generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range. There is no mention whatsoever in the Hunt reference as to selecting a screen range from a client terminal and generating an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Hunt only teaches a method and system for transmitting graphical images from a server to a client in response to a client request. There is no need in the system of Hunt to select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

The Office Action, dated June 4, 2004, on page 6 states:

Hunt explicitly discloses the operator of the client machine specifying image control information. The image is customized according to the need of the client computer (column 2, lines 34-40, column 3, lines 3-4, 6-10, 18-20, 47-52, column 5, lines 1-5, column 9, lines 40-42, column 11, lines 5-9, 31-33, 35-37, 40-42, and column 12, lines 20-23, 49-51).

Applicants respectfully disagree that any of these sections teaches or suggests generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image

data from the specified screen range. Hunt teaches in column 2, lines 31-43, that a graphical image is transmitted from a server machine to a client machine by receiving, at the server machine, a request for a graphical image from a client machine, the graphical image being stored on the server machine and having a predetermined total image size; obtaining image control information; determining an appropriate amount of data for the graphical image to be transmitted based on at least the image control information, the appropriate amount being less than or equal to the predetermined total image size; and transmitting the graphical image to the extent of the appropriate amount from the server machine to the client machine.

Hunt further teaches at column 9, lines 37-45, that the client processing 700 initially requests 702 a graphical image file from the server (server machine) 102. As an example, the request would identify the graphical image file desired together with a total image size and a requested quality level. Then, a decision 704 determines whether the customization flag is set at the client 104. If the decision block 704 determines that the customization flag is set, then image control data is sent 706 from the client to the server 102. The image control data is taught at column 12, lines 44-54, that the client image control data can, for example, include two basic types of data: user data and client system data. The user data includes, for example, user preference, intended use, and a specific quality level request. The intended use, for example, is for display or for printing a particular size graphical image. The user preference could be a user selected choice of quality versus size for image files or something that is predicted for the user. The client system data, for example, includes compression schemes supported by the client and server, transmission performance data, equipment information.

These sections of Hunt clearly show that the client requests an image from the server, and based on client image control data, which is included in the request, an image is sent by the server to the client that meets with the client image control data. Nowhere in the Hunt reference, is it taught that the client selects a screen range from a client terminal and generates an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Hunt only teaches a method and system for transmitting graphical images from a server to a client in response to a client request. There is no need in the system of Hunt to select

a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

Furthermore, there is not so much as a suggestion in either of the references to modify the references to include such features. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hunt or Anupam that a problem exists for which generating an image file in response to an operator of said client terminal specifying a screen range of said client terminal, wherein the image file is generated based on image data from the specified screen range is a solution. To the contrary, Hunt only transmits graphical images from a server to a client in response to a client request. Anupam teaches transmitting updated URL information to a collaborative session. Neither of the references even recognizes a need to select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

One of ordinary skill in the art, being presented only with Hunt and Anupam, and without having a prior knowledge of Applicants' claimed invention, would not have found it obvious to combine and modify Hunt and Anupam to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. To the contrary, even if one were somehow motivated to combine Hunt and Anupam, and it were somehow possible to combine the systems, the result would not be the invention, as recited in claim 1. The resulting system still would not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range.

Thus, neither Hunt nor Anupam, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features in independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 8. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 5, 7 and 8, the specific features of claims 12-24 are not taught or suggested by Hunt and Anupam, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 1, 5 and 8 respectively, the combination of Hunt and Anupam do not teach or suggest the specific features recited in dependent claims 12-24. For example, with regard to claims 12, 17 and 20, the combination of Hunt and Anupam does not teach or suggest where the operator specifies a screen range of said client terminal by manipulating a mouse to define a

frame, wherein the frame encloses the screen range. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. As discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to manipulate a mouse to define a frame that would enclose a screen range.

As an additional example, with regard to claims 13, 18 and 21, the combination of Hunt and Anupam does not teach or suggest where the operator specifies a screen range of said client terminal by selecting an application window, wherein a frame of the application window defines the screen range. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. Again, as discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to specify a screen range of a client terminal by selecting an application window that defines the screen range.

As a further example, with regard to claims 14, 19 and 22, the combination of Hunt and Anupam does not teach or suggest acquiring a device context of a desktop window and generating a desktop window image corresponding to the device context of the desktop window, wherein the screen range is a portion of the desktop window. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. Once again, as discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the Hunt reference to acquire a device context of a desktop window and generate a desktop window image corresponding to the device context of the desktop window.

As a final example, with regard to claims 15, 16, 23 and 24 the combination of Hunt and Anupam does not teach or suggest wherein the operator of said client terminal specifies the screen range during a capture mode, as recited in claims 15 and 23 or suspending the capture mode, receiving input from the operator to activate a hidden window image and resuming the capture mode, as recited in claims 16 and 24. The Office Action alleges that Hunt teaches this feature. Once again, as discussed above, Hunt does not select a screen range from a client terminal and generate an image based on image data from the specified screen range. Thus, there would be no need for the

Hunt reference to make use of a capture mode to specify the screen range. In fact, the term "capture mode" does not appear in the Hunt reference.

Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claims 1, 5, and 8 respectively, dependent claims 12-24 are also distinguishable over Hunt and Anupam by virtue of the specific features recited in these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: September 7, 2004

Francis Lammes

Francis Lammes  
Reg. No. 55,353  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
Agent for Applicant